**Plan**: The USFG ought to provide Pell Grants to eligible prisoners in the United States criminal justice system.

Advantage 1 is crime

Lack of Pell Grants decimates post-secondary prison education programs which independently jacks crime rates. **Buzzini 09**[[1]](#footnote-1)

[Brackets in original text] It’s no secret that the education system in the United States is in shambles – and not just for inmates. Students aren’t receiving a proper education, which encourages the nation’s youth to get involved in gangs, drugs, and violence. **Many inmates can’t** even **read well, ranking** in **at** “maybe a **seventh-grade level**” (Leder 1). **Were it possible** for inmates **to receive a**n education while serving time (a GED if an equivalent had not been attained, followed by a post-secondary **degree**) **they would have a much greater chance of escaping** the clutches of **poverty and** their ties to **illegal activity when** they are **released** back into society. This must have been the line of thinking that inspired the inception of the first post-secondary correctional education program, which began in 1953 at the University of Southern Illinois in Menard. Such a program must have been a bit ahead of its time, because by 1965 only 11 more post-secondary correctional education (PCSE) programs appeared. 1965 was a landmark year for PCSE it marked the first time that inmates were eligible to receive Pell Grants to fund their college aspirations. **Thanks to** the availability of **federal funding, programs began popping up nationwide.** In 1973 there were 182 programs; by 1982 there were 350. Programs reached their peak when, **in the** early 19**90s, there were** a total of **772** on-site college programs **in 1,287 prisons** (Taylor “Pell Grants” 2). **The majority of inmates covered their costs with** the aid of **the Pell Grant. However, in** 19**94, thanks to** the prevailing **“tough on crime” attitude** of the time, **inmates** were **no longer** able to **receive** federal aid in the form of **Pell Grants. While peak enrollment** in PCSE programs **totaled at 12 percent** of inmate populations, **the** s0-called **“deteriorated state” counted less than 4 percent** (Taylor “Pell Grants” 3). There is **myriad statistical data** to **show that education programs** inside prisons **aid in** actual **rehab**ilitation **and** do **reduce recidivism** rates. But these facts were glossed over as politicians wowed their constituents with their tough policies regarding crime. However, they didn’t bother to mention to their constituents that “Massachusetts, Maryland, and New York are among the states [that reported] reductions in recidivism of as high as 15.5 percent for inmates who participated in education programs (Freedman 6).” That 15.5 percent reduction means 15.5 percent of inmates were *actually* rehabilitated, as opposed to merely punished, during their time on the inside. The numbers are even more impressive on a national scale, as “**inmates with** at least two years of **college had a 10 percent re-arrest rate; the national average is 60 percent**” (“Statehouses Debate…”). That means 50 percent less people went back to prison, simply because they completed some form of higher education. It is for reasons such as this that “critics lament the loss of **Pell Grants** as short-sighted in light of studies documenting **lower recidivism** and misconduct rates among inmates who pursue post-secondary education” (Freedman 8). It truly is a serious loss, for the depletion of funding via Pell Grants for PSCE has resulted in a devastating loss of programs nationwide, despite such programs’ ability to reduce recidivism **and** markedly **rehabilitate** many **inmates who participate.** Should the Pell Grant be re-instated, corrections in America would see a much-needed turn for the better.

Crime kills soft power. The author works for the United Nations, so he’s most qualified on how the United States’ international reputation is declining. **Falk 12**[[2]](#footnote-2)

This unabashed avowal of imperial goals is the main thesis of the article, perhaps most graphically expressed in the following words: "The United States can increase the effectiveness of its military forces and make the world safe for soft power, America's inherent comparative advantage." As the glove fits the hand, **soft power** complements hard power within the wider enterprise of transforming the world in the United States' image, or at least in the ideal version of the United States' sense of self.

The authors acknowledge (rather parenthetically) that their strategy **may not work if the US continues** much longer **to be seen unfavourably abroad as a national abode of** drugs, **crime**, violence, fiscal irresponsibility, family breakdown, and political gridlock. **They make a** rather meaningless **plea to restore "a** **healthy democracy" at home as a prelude to** the heavy lifting of **democratising the world, but they** do not pretend medical knowledge, and **offer no prescriptions for restoring the health of the American body politic.** And now, 16 years after their article appeared, it would appear that the adage, "disease unknown, cure unknown", applies.

Soft power independently solves multiple existential risks. **Nye and Armitage 07**[[3]](#footnote-3)

Soft power is the ability to attract people to our side without coercion. Legitimacy is central to soft power. **If a** people or **nation believes American objectives to be legitimate, we are more likely to persuade them to follow our lead** without using threats and bribes. **Legitimacy can also reduce opposition to**—and the costs of—**using hard power when the situation demands.** Appealing to others’ values, interests, and preferences can, in certain circumstances, replace the dependence on carrots and sticks. Cooperation is always a matter of degree, and it is profoundly influenced by attraction…The information age has heightened political consciousness, but also made political groupings less cohesive. Small, adaptable, transnational networks have access to tools of destruction that are increasingly cheap, easy to conceal, and more readily available. Although the integration of the global economy has brought tremendous benefits, **threats such as pandemic disease and the collapse of financial markets are more distributed and more likely to arise without warning. The threat of** widespread physical harm to the planet posed by **nuclear catastrophe** has existed for half a century, though the realization of the threat **will become more likely as the number of nuclear weapons states increases.** The potential security challenges posed by **climate change raise** the possibility of an entirely **new** set of **threats** for the United States **to consider** The next administration will need a strategy that speaks to each of these challenges. Whatever specific approach it decides to take, two principles will be certain: First, an extra dollar spent on hard power will not necessarily bring an extra dollar’s worth of security. It is difficult to know how to invest wisely when there is not a budget based on a strategy that specifies trade-offs among instruments. Moreover, hard power capabilities are a necessary but insufficient guarantee of security in today’s context. Second, success and failure will turn on the ability to win new allies and strengthen old ones both in government and civil society. The key is not how many enemies the United States kills, but how many allies it grows. **States** and non-state actors who improve their ability to draw in allies will gain competitive advantages in today’s environment. Those **who alienate potential friends will stand at greater risk.** China has invested in its soft power to ensure access to resources and to ensure against efforts to undermine its military modernization. **Terrorists depend on** their ability to attract **support from the crowd** at least as much as their ability to destroy the enemy’s will to fight.

Existential risk outweighs every other impact by orders of magnitude because of the lost potential for future generations. **Bostrom 11**[[4]](#footnote-4)

Even if we use **the most conservative** of these **estimates,** which entirely ignores the possibility of space colonization and software minds, we **find that the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than** the value of **1018 human lives.  This implies that** the expected value of **reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least ten times the value of a billion human lives.**  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or 1052 lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives.

Util is the only moral system available to policy-makers. **Goodin 90** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. **Public officials** are obliged to **make** their **choices under uncertainty**, and uncertainty **of a** very **special sort** at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, **[they] are** relatively **poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they** typically **do know are** generalities: **averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people** as a result of their various possible choices, **but that is all. That** is enough to **allow[s]** public **policy-makers to use** the **util**itarian **calculus** – assuming they want to use it at all – to chose general rules or conduct.

The neg must defend one unconditional advocacy. Conditionality is bad because it makes the neg a moving target which kills 1AR strategy. She’ll kick it if I cover it and extend it if I undercover it, meaning I have no strategic options. Also, it’s unreciprocal because I can’t kick the AC. Fairness comes first because it’s a gateway issue to determining the better debater.

Err Aff on theory. Negs won 8% more rounds in Harvard prelims[[6]](#footnote-6).

The role of the ballot is to consider yourself a policy-maker and vote for the best United States criminal justice system policy. Reasons to prefer.

1. Political Engagement.

Roleplaying as a policy maker is key to create informed political advocates.

**Schaap 5 [[7]](#footnote-7)**

**Learning political theory is largely about acquiring a vocabulary** that enables one **to reflect** more **critically and precisely** about the terms on which human beings (do and should) co-operate for and compete over public goods, symbolic and material. As such, political theory is necessarily abstract and general. But, **competency in political theory requires an ability to move from the general to the particular and back again**, not simply by applying general principles to particular events and experiences but **by reflecting on and rearticulating concepts in the light of the particular. Role play is an effective technique for teaching political theory because it requires that students employ political concepts in a particular context so that learning takes place as students try out new vocabularies** together with their peers and a lifelong learner in the subject: their teacher.

Engagement with the political sphere is key to solve extinction. **Boggs 2k**[[8]](#footnote-8)

But it is a very deceptive and misleading minimalism. While Oakeshott debunks political mechanisms and rational planning, as either useless or dangerous, the actually existing power structure-replete with its own centralized state apparatus, institutional hierarchies, conscious designs, and indeed, rational plans-remains fully intact, insulated from the minimalist critique. In other words, ideologies and plans are perfectly acceptable for elites who preside over established governing systems, but not for ordinary citizens or groups anxious to challenge the status quo. Such one-sided **minimalism gives carte blanche to elites who naturally desire** as much space to maneuver as possible. The flight from “abstract principles” rules out ethical attacks on injustices that may pervade the status quo (**slavery or imperialist wars**, for example) insofar as those injustices might be seen as too deeply embedded in the social and institutional matrix of the time to be the target of oppositional political action. If politics is reduced to nothing other than a process of everyday muddling-through, then people are condemned to accept the harsh realities of an exploitative and authoritarian system, with no choice but to yield to the dictates of “conventional wisdom”. Systematic attempts to ameliorate oppressive conditions would, in Oakeshott’s view, turn into a political nightmare. A belief that totalitarianism might results from extreme attempts to put society in order is one thing; to argue that all politicized efforts to change the world are necessary doomed either to impotence or totalitarianism requires a completely different (and indefensible) set of premises. Oakeshott’s minimalism poses yet another, but still related, range of problems: **the shrinkage of politics hardly suggests that corporate colonization, social hierarchies, or** centralized state and **military institutions will magically disappear** from people’s lives. Far from it: **the public space vacated by ordinary citizens**, well informed and ready to fight for their interests, **simply gives elites more room to consolidate their own power** and privilege. Beyond that, the fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian civil society, not too far removed from the excessive individualism, social Darwinism and urban violence of the American landscape could open the door to a modern Leviathan intent on restoring order and unity in the face of social disintegration. Viewed in this light, the contemporary drift towards antipolitics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more authoritarian and reactionary guise-or it could simply end up reinforcing the dominant state-corporate system. In either case, the state would probably become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collective interests that had vanished from civil society.16 And either outcome would run counter to the facile antirationalism of Oakeshott’s Burkean muddling-through theories.

2. Clash. Topical discussion is key to have a stable locus for debate. It is literally the only way to have meaningful discourse or solve anything. Bracketing out discussions is necessary- the failure of the occupy movement is an empirical example of the turn.

**White 11** [[9]](#footnote-9)

From the beginning, **Occupy** Wall Street has been **committed to direct democracy**. Anyone can participate in the General Assembly, the movement's main decision making body, by offering ideas or questioning other peoples' proposals. But **that** model **is coming under strain** as the still-nascent movement becomes more organized and maps a way forward. The last few weeks have seen a proliferation of working groups devoted to tasks that include managing food and supplies, coordinating community outreach and overseeing nearly $500,000 in donations. As the movement becomes larger and its structure grows more complex, protesters are debating ways to reform the General Assembly, which many veteran protesters say has become too unwieldy. "**People are extremely frustrated** with the process and how it is now," said protester Ronny Nunez. "The General **Assemblies** are great, they **offer** the ability for **anyone to speak** out, **but** there comes a point in which **you have so many people** involved in the process that **it loses** any sort of **effectiveness**." Nunez cited a recent General Assembly in which **members** of the sanitation working group **sought** emergency funding to purchase **trash bins. Deliberations dragged on** as people offered amendments, including a requirement that the protesters purchase their supplies secondhand, that "**made it** effectively **impossible to get** the **funding** they needed," Nunez said. Follow us "We're going through all these different growing pains where we're learning, and we're learning that some things work on a smaller level and some on a bigger level," Nunez said. Spokes Council Protesters are circulating a proposal to streamline the process with something called a Spokes Council. Under that model, the various working groups would nominate representatives to participate in the General Assembly on their behalf. The spokesperson would rotate, and during the General Assembly they would periodically conferring with their respective working groups, which would be seated behind them. The idea has already been blocked once in the General Assembly, but is set to come up again. A protester arrived at a recent meeting of the Outreach working group to explain the proposal. The current format had become "untenable," he argued. He noted that under the Spokes Council, anyone can join a working group and thereby have a say. "I think that's bulls-t," another protester responded, arguing that the idea endangered the movement's inclusiveness. "In participatory democracy," the protester presenting the idea shot back, "as long as you allow access at all times you've done your bit." Marisa Holmes, who on Monday night explained the Spokes Council idea during a meeting of the Structure working group, argued that the idea encouraged people to become more deeply invested in Occupy Wall Street by having them join working groups that are essential to the movement's day-to-day operations. Hours-long meetings where people debate the logistics of laundry, Holmes said, can vitiate the process by leading working groups to avoid the General Assembly altogether. "The General Assembly has been an amazing body for movement building, and it enables people to have a voice for what is sometimes the first time," Holmes said. "We don't want to destroy it but we see that there's a lot of work done in a not always accountable and transparent way." Dilemma: Preserve Participatory Structure or Become More-Efficient? The tension between people who want to preserve the movement's initial qualities and those who want to make it more efficient reflects an overlapping but different set of goals, said Todd Gitlin, a professor of journalism and communications at Columbia University who observed the evolution of an activist movement as president of Students for a Democratic Society. He said the movement will need to find a way to accommodate the "purists and pragmatists," or those for whom "the very participation is the goal" and those whose "goals have to do with moving the world." "You can think of this as the process by which a nation-state is formed," Gitlin said. "At one point anyone who shows up is a member, and then at another point those who have been members and have an appreciation for tasks to be done say 'wait a minute, we need to capitalize on our experience and value our continuity'... You're talking about the founding of some kind of functioning democracy, and the rules continue to evolve in nation-states, too." As that process unfolds, observers and members of the movement worry about the movement becoming fractured or co-opted. "My fundamental question is why would anyone in this movement, which is pro-democracy and pro-consensus, repeatedly bring up a proposal after it was already blocked, which is very divisive?" asked Etan Ben-Ami, a licensed social worker who is skeptical of the Spokes Council idea. "On the left we always have to guard what's occurred in the past frequently: takeovers by the vanguard left that infiltrates the process and pushes an agenda." On Monday night, Edward Ledford sat by the Structure working group, listening intently as Holmes explained the Spokes Council idea. Ledford, 61, had traveled from Lincoln, Nebraska armed with a plan, based on an obscure academic paper by a mathematician, for a series of deliberative juries that flow into a parliamentary body. Ledford spoke eloquently of the challenges Occupy Wall Street faces, repeatedly referencing James Madison's Federalist Paper No. 10, which warned presciently against the danger factionalism poses to democracy. Follow us "**People do not** seem to have **learn**ed their **history**. I see **a very classical historical error unfolding**," Ledford said, adding that he had seen "several red flags" in less than a day. "The **movement has to be structured**, but if it's structured in a bad way it is going to fail. **Direct** participatory **democracy has in every instance**, once it takes hold **of a** national **institution**, basically **destroyed it because** of **its propensity to succumb to the violence of faction**."

3. Switch side topical debate is the only meaningful forum to foster critical thinking. The impact is extinction. **Harrigan 8** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

Additionally, **there are social benefits to the practice of requiring students to debate both sides of controversial issues**. Dating back to the Greek rhetorical tradition, great value has been placed on the benefit of testing each argument relative to all others in the marketplace of ideas. **Like** those who argue on behalf of the efficiency-maximizing benefits of **free market competition**, it is believed that **arguments are most rigorously tested** (and conceivably refined **and improved**) **when compared to all available alternatives.** Even for beliefs that have seemingly been ingrained in consensus opinion or in cases where the public at-large is unlikely to accept a particular position, it has been argued that they should remain open for public discussion and deliberation (Mill, 1975). Along these lines, the greatest benefit of switching sides, which goes to the heart of contemporary debate, is its inducement of critical thinking. Defined as "reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do" (Ennis, 1987, p.10), **critical thinking learned through debate teaches students not just how to** advocate and **argue, but how to decide as well.** Each and every student, whether in debate or (more likely) at some later point in life, will be placed in the position of the decision-maker. Faced with competing options whose costs and benefits are initially unclear, **critical thinking is necessary to assess all** the **possible outcomes** of each choice, compare their relative merits, and arrive at some final decision about which is preferable. In some instances, such as choosing whether to eat Chinese or Indian food for dinner, the importance of making the correct decision is minor. For many other decisions, however, the implications of choosing an imprudent course of action are potentially grave. As Robert Crawford notes, there are "issues of unsurpassed important in the daily lives of millions upon millions of people...being decided to a considerable extent by the power of public speaking" (2003). Although the days of the Cold War are over, and the risk that "The next Pearl Harbor could be 'compounded by hydrogen" (Ehninger and Brockriede, 1978, p.3) is greatly reduced, **the manipulation of public support before the invasion of Iraq** in 2003 **points to the continuing necessity of** training **a** well-informed and **critically-aware public** (Zarefsky, 2007). **In the absence of debate-trained critical thinking, ignorant** but ambitious **politicians and** persuasive but **nefarious leaders would** be much more likely to **draw the** country, and possibly the **world**, **into conflicts** with incalculable losses in terms of human well-being. Given the myriad **threats of global proportions** that **will require incisive solutions, including global warming,** the spread of **pandemic disease**s, **and** the **proliferation** of weapons of mass destruction, **cultivating a** robust and effective **society of critical decision-makers is essential.**

4. Switch side debate.

Micropolitics militarizes the debate-space. Every single thing we do in and out of round becomes subject to criticism. That destroys debate as a protected space for critical thinking.

**Coverstone 95** writes[[11]](#footnote-11)

Yet, Mitchell goes too far. In two important areas, his argument is slightly miscalibrated. First, Mitchell underestimates the value of debate as it is currently practiced. **There is great**er **value in the** somewhat **insular nature of our** present **activity** than he assumes. **Debate's inward focus creates an unusual space for training and practice with the tools of modem political discourse. Such space is largely unavailable elsewhere in American society.** Second, Mitchell overextends his concept of **activism**. He argues fervently for mass action along ideological lines. Such a turn **replaces control by society's information elite with control by an elite all our own.** More than any other group in America today, practitioners of debate should recognize the subtle issues upon which political diversity turns. Mitchell's search for broad themes around which to organize mass action runs counter to this insight. As a result, Mitchell's call for **an outward activist turn threatens to subvert the very values it seeks to achieve.**

Multiple studies confirm that switch side debate about the topic increases critical thinking. It’s the largest link to education. **Keller et al 1** writes[[12]](#footnote-12)

Since its origins in classical times, academic debate has been recognized as one of the best methods of learning and applying the attributes of critical thinking (Freeley, 1996). **Recent empirical studies of** students participating in competitive interschool **forensics** societies **illustrate the link between debating and** proficiency in **critical thinking.** Colbert (1987) found that students involved in intercollegiate debating for one year showed a larger pretest to posttest gain on a critical thinking test than a nondebating control group. Likewise, Shinn (1995) discovered that, after statistically controlling for intelligence, **high school [debaters]** students who engaged in two years of competitive debating **exhibited higher levels of critical thinking than** a comparison group of **nondebaters.**

Debates have been recommended as a strategy to engage students in active learning in the classroom (Bean, 1996; Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Schroeder & Ebert, 1983). The use of in-class debates has been reported in subjects as diverse as sociology and dentistry (Huryn, 1986; Scannapieco, 1997). Nevertheless, a search of the literature revealed no reference to student debates within social work education, despite evidence that debates have been assigned in some social work courses (Zlotnik, Rome,& DePanfilis, 1998). Furthermore, the authors discovered only two studies, both by Combs and Bourne (1989,1994), which provide empirical evidence of the value of debates in a classroom context. In their initial report, Combs and Bourne (1989) presented findings on the use of debates in two upper level business courses with a combined enrollment of 59 students. **Nearly 80% of the students** (n=47) **believed** the **debate**s **provided them with a better understanding of both sides of the issues** than a standard lecture format would have. Likewise, **66%** (n=39) **felt they had learned more than** if the course material had been presented **in a lecture.** Another important finding was that **students' confidence in their public speaking skills increased** following the debates. In general, there was satisfaction with the debates. At the beginning of the course only 57% of the students (n=35) looked forward to the upcoming debates, but by the end of the course 85% (n=50) stated that they enjoyed the debates, and 71% (n=42) wished debates were used in other courses. Combs and Bourne (1994) extended their initial study to cover a five-year period with a combined sample of over 500 students. The results were even stronger in favor of using debates, perhaps reflecting improvement in the instructors' application of the debate format over time.

5. The resolution is the most accessible, researchable, and rigorously developed baseline for debating. You should affirm it. **Galloway 7** writes[[13]](#footnote-13)

The central claim to this essay is that debate works best when it is dialogic and the topic is an invitation to participate. There are three pedagogical benefits to conceptualizing the resolution as an invitation. First, all teams have equal access to the resolution. Second, teams spend the entire year preparing approaches for and against the resolution. Finally, the resolution represents a community consensus of worthwhile and equitably debatable topics rooted in a collective history and experience of debate. First, teams have equal access to the resolution. **The problem with relying upon prior disclosure, case lists, and word of mouth is that access is** often **tied to** opportunity and **resources**. While it is true that there has been a phenomenal upsurge in the availability of case list access through technology, it is still the case that **the resolution provides the most equal and fair access for all** teams concerned. **Each school** in the community **knows the wording** of the resolution, even if they are not aware of the modifications made to any particular case. The notion that the negative team can rely upon the benevolence of the affirmative to provide strategic options radically tilts the argumentative table in favor of the affirmative. Providing the resolution as a baseline test operates as a demand for the negative’s approach to the topic to be heard. **Instead of leaving the aff**irmative **in** complete **control of what** approaches to the topic **the neg**ative **is allowed to argue, debate** as a dialogue **uses the resolution** as a centerpiece of a demand to be heard. Second, teams spend the entire year preparing approaches for and against the resolution. The best debates often come from in-depth clash over a core area of the topic. **It is not uncommon for debaters to spend between forty and sixty hours a week on debate,** carefully refining their approaches to the topic. A common rejoinder is that debaters should think on their feet, and be prepared to debate against unusual affirmative cases and plans. While thinking on one’s feet is certainly valuable, **allowing one side** to think on their feet with **the benefit of research,** prior preparation, **coaching, and thinking through arguments in advance, while depriving the other side of all such benefits hardly seems** like a strategy that will result in a **productive** dialogue. Thinking on one’s feet is always framed by one’s past thoughts, arguments, and research base. Instead, debates are best when both sides have the opportunity to think ahead to the range of choices that the affirmative team can provide to the resolution. While there may always be some ground for the negative to respond to the affirmative team, that ground should stem from the resolution in order to maximize the benefits of the dialogical exchange which competitive debate allows. Finally, **there has been** a concerted **community effort to ensure that the resolution provides subjects** of controversy **that are controversial, balanced, and anticipate a nuanced approach**. Ross Smith notes, “Affirmative teams try to find what they think might be a slam dunk case, but in crafting resolutions the idea is to find a controversial area with ground for both sides” (2000). The resolution is the result of a painstaking process; **it is thoroughly discussed, debated, and** ultimately **submitted** to the debate community **for** a **vote**. It is framed, ultimately, as an issue about which reasonable minds could differ. **Reliance upon alternative systems**, such as germaneness, lists of ground provided by the other side in the debate, or the fact that a team has run a case in the past, **betrays the central point of having a dialogue about the resolution** and undermines the consensus upon which the whole enterprise depends. And while there are obviously some valid complaints about individual topics, as a whole, **resolutions allow for a wide range of approaches** to issues of the day. It is striking on the 20082009 resolution that conservative groups like the **Heritage** Foundation **and** the **CATO** Institute **as well as Oxfam and the Sierra Club oppose** **ag**ricultural **subsidies**, if **for very different reasons**. Teams could easily find evidence that subsidies go down a rat-hole, are counter-productive to free market economics, as well as arguing that subsidies entrench racism both domestically and globally, and prevent an ethic of care toward the global environment. Those that argue that the topic does not access issues relevant to a wide variety of special interests and minority groups may simply be asking for too much. Establishing the resolution as the bright line standard for evaluation of equity at the argumentative table allows all sides to the controversy access to formulating their approach to both sides of the topic question.

6. Focus on personal experience kills democracy and causes war and oppression.

**Boor Tonn 5** [[14]](#footnote-14)

This widespread recognition that access to public deliberative processes and the ballot is a baseline of any genuine democracy points to the most curious irony of the conversation movement: portions of its constituency. Numbering among the most fervid dialogic loyalists have been some feminists and multiculturalists who represent groups historically denied both the right to speak in public and the ballot. Oddly, some feminists who championed the slogan "The Personal Is Political" to emphasize ways relational power can oppress tend to ignore similar dangers lurking in the appropriation of conversation and dialogue in public deliberation. Yet the conversational model's **emphasis on empowerment through intimacy can duplicate the power networks that** traditionally **exclude**d **females and nonwhites** and gave rise to numerous, sometimes necessarily uncivil, demands for democratic inclusion. Formalized participation structures in deliberative processes obviously cannot ensure the elimination of relational power blocs, but, as Freeman pointed out, the absence of formal rules leaves relational power unchecked and potentially capricious. Moreover, **the privileging of** the self, **personal experience**s, and individual perspectives of reality intrinsic in the conversational paradigm **mirrors justifications** once **used by dominant groups who used their own** lives, **beliefs**, and interests **as templates for hegemonic social premises to oppress** women, the lower class, and people of color. Paradigms infused with the therapeutic language of emotional healing and coping likewise flirt with the type of psychological diagnoses once ascribed to disaffected women. But as Betty Friedan's landmark 1963 The Feminist Mystique argued, the cure for female alienation was neither tranquilizers nor attitude adjustments fostered through psychotherapy but, rather, unrestricted opportunities.102 The price exacted by promoting approaches to complex public issues- models that cast conventional deliberative processes, including the marshaling of evidence beyond individual subjectivity, as "elitist" or "monologic"-can be steep. **Consider comments of an aide to** President George W. **Bush made before** reports concluding **Iraq** harbored no weapons of mass destruction, the primary justification for a U.S.-led war costing thousands of lives. Investigative reporters and other persons sleuthing for hard facts, **he claimed**, operate "in what we call the reality-based community." Such people "believe that solutions emerge from [the] judicious study of discernible reality." Then baldly flexing the muscle afforded by increasingly popular social-constructionist and poststructuralist models for conflict resolution, he added: "That's not the way the world really works anymore . . . **We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality.** And while you're studying that reality- judiciously, as you will-we'll act again, creating other new realities."103 The recent fascination with public conversation and dialogue most likely is a product of frustration with the tone of much public, political discourse. Such concerns are neither new nor completely without merit. Yet, as Burke insightfully pointed out nearly six decades ago, "A perennial embarrassment in liberal apologetics has arisen from its 'surgical' proclivity: its attempt to outlaw a malfunction by outlawing the function." **The attempt to eliminate flaws** in a process **by eliminating the entire process**, he writes, "**is like trying to eliminate heart disease by eliminating hearts."**104 **Because public argument** and deliberative processes **are the "heart" of true democracy, supplanting those models** with social and therapeutic conversation and dialogue **jeopardizes the** very pulse and **lifeblood of democracy itself.**

7. Representations of nuclear war are key to genuine resistance to violence. **Schatz 12**[[15]](#footnote-15)

Any **hesitancy to deploy images of apocalypse** out of the risk of acting in a biopolitical manner **ignores how any** particular **metaphor**—apocalyptic or not—**always risks getting co-opted. It does not excuse inaction**. Clearly hegemonic forces have already assumed control of determining environmental practices when one looks at the debates surrounding off--‐shore drilling, climate change, and biodiversity within the halls of Congress. “As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems … will go unsolved … only to fester more ominously into the future. … [E]cological crisis … cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context … of internationalized markets, finance, and communications” (Boggs 774). If it weren’t for people such as Watson connecting things like whaling to the end of the world it wouldn’t get the needed coverage to enter into public discourse. It takes big news to make headlines and hold attention spans in the electronic age. Sometimes it even takes a reality TV show on Animal Planet. As Luke reminds us, “Those who dominate the world exploit their positions to their advantage by defining how the world is known. Unless they also face resistance, questioning, and challenge from those who are dominated, they certainly will remain the dominant forces” (2003: 413). Merely **sitting back and theorizing** over metaphorical deployments does a grave injustice to the gains activists are making on the ground. It also **allows hegemonic institutions to continually define the debate** over the environment by framing out any attempt for significant change, whether it be radical or reformist. Only by jumping on every opportunity for resistance can ecocriticism have the hopes of combatting the current ecological reality. This means we must recognize that **we cannot fully escape the master’s house** since the surrounding environment always shapes any form of resistance. Therefore**, we ought to act even if we may get co-opted**. As Foucault himself reminds us, “instead of radial ruptures more often one is dealing with mobile and transitory points of resistance, producing cleavages in a society that shift about[.] … And it is doubtless the strategic codification of these points of resistance that makes a revolution possible, somewhat similar to the way in which the state relies on the institutional integration of power relationships. It is in this sphere of force relations that we must try to analyze the mechanisms of power” (96--‐97). Here Foucault “asks us to think about resistance differently, as not anterior to power, but a component of it. If we take seriously these notions on the exercise and circulation of power, then we … open … up the field of possibility to talk about particular kinds of environmentalism” (Rutherford 296). This is not to say that all actions are resistant. Rather, the revolutionary actions that are truly resistant oftentimes appear mundane since it is more about altering the intelligibility that frames discussions around the environment than any specific policy change. Again, this is why people like Watson use one issue as a jumping off point to talk about wider politics of ecological awareness. Campaigns that look to the government or a single policy but for a moment, and then go on to challenge hegemonic interactions with the environment through other tactics, allows us to codify strategic points of resistance in numerous places at once. Again, this does not mean we must agree with every tactic. It does mean that even failed attempts are meaningful. For example, while PETA’s ad campaigns have drawn criticism for comparing factory farms to the Holocaust, and featuring naked women who’d rather go naked than wear fur, their importance extends beyond the ads alone6. By bringing the issues to the forefront they draw upon known metaphors and reframe the way people talk about animals despite their potentially anti--‐Semitic and misogynist underpinnings. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s theorization of the multitude serves as an excellent illustration of how utilizing the power of the master’s biopolitical tools can become powerful enough to deconstruct its house despite the risk of co--‐optation or backlash. For them, the multitude is defined by the growing global force of people around the world who are linked together by their common struggles without being formally organized in a hierarchal way. While Hardt and Negri mostly talk about the multitude in relation to global capitalism, their understanding of the commons and analysis of resistance is useful for any ecocritic. They explain, [T]he multitude has matured to such an extent that it is becoming able, through its networks of communication and cooperation … [and] its production of the common, to sustain an alternative democratic society on its own. … Revolutionary politics must grasp, in the movement of the multitudes and through the accumulation of common and cooperative decisions, the moment of rupture … that can create a new world. In the face of the destructive state of exception of biopower, then, there is also a constituent state of exception of democratic biopolitics[,] … creating … a new constitutive temporality. (357) Once one understands the world as interconnected—instead of constructed by different nation--‐states and single environments—conditions in one area of the globe couldn’t be conceptually severed from any other. In short, we’d all have a stake in the global commons. Ecocritics can then utilize biopolitics to shape discourse and fight against governmental biopower by waking people up to the pressing need to inaugurate a new future for there to be any future. Influencing other people through argument and end--‐of--‐the--‐world tactics is not the same biopower of the state so long as it doesn’t singularize itself but for temporary moments. Therefore, “it is not unreasonable to hope that in a biopolitical future (after the defeat of biopower) war will no longer be possible, and the intensity of the cooperation and communication among singularities … will destroy its [very] possibility” (Hardt & Negri 347). In The context of capitalism, when wealth fails to trickle down it would be seen as a problem for the top since it would stand testament to their failure to equitably distribute wealth. In the context of environmentalism, not--‐in--‐my--‐backyard reasoning that displaces ecological destruction elsewhere would be exposed for the failure that it is. There is no backyard that is not one’s own. Ultimately, **images of planetary doom demonstrate how we are all interconnected and** in doing so **inaugurate a** new **world where multitudes**, and not governments, **guide** the fate of **the planet**.

8. Debating nuclear scenarios is key to stave off actual nuclear war.

**Harvard Nuclear Study Group 83** writes[[16]](#footnote-16)

The question is grisly, but nonetheless it must be asked. **Nuclear war cannot be avoided** simply **by refusing to think about it.** Indeed the task of **reducing** the likelihood of **nuclear war should begin with** an effort to **understand[ing] how it might start. When strategists in Washington** or Moscow **study** the possible origins of **nuclear war, they discuss “scenarios,”** imagined sequences of future events that could trigger the use of nuclear weaponry. Scenarios are, of course, speculative exercises. They often leave out the political developments that might lead to the use of force in order to focus on military dangers. That nuclear war scenarios are even more speculative than most is something for which we can be thankful, for it reflects humanity’s fortunate lack of experience with atomic warfare since 1945. But imaginary as they are, **nuclear scenarios can help identify problems not understood or dangers not yet** prevented because they have not been **foreseen.**

Preempts to her role of the ballot.

1. All her offense is non-unique. Her Columbia wins and disclosure are sufficient. No reason this round is key.

2. Non-unique. Speaking vocally on an online forum is sufficient. More people are on NSDUpdate than in this debate.

3. No reason the ballot is key. Speak about this neg outside of round. That is sufficient to solve.

4. Empirically denied. People have been running activist cases for decades. These existed in policy before LD debate existed as an activity, and we still haven’t seen an activist shift. That’s a terminal solvency take out.

5. Aff choice solves 100% of your offense. When you’re aff, you can set the topic of discussion. Allowing the neg to change the framework for the round kills clash which link turns discourse arguments.
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